



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,410	09/26/2006	Shaow Lin	DC10102 PCT1	9220
137	7590	03/06/2008	EXAMINER	
DOW CORNING CORPORATION	CO1232		LOEWE, ROBERT S	
2200 W. SALZBURG ROAD				
P.O. BOX 994			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MIDLAND, MI 48686-0994			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/06/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents.admin@dowcorning.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/594,410	LIN, SHAO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	ROBERT LOEWE	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/26/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***International Search Report***

Reference EP-780113, determined to be an "X" reference cited in the international search report is not relied upon in a rejection since the upper limit of integer x of EP-780113 is 200 while the lower limit of integer x of instant claim 1 is 251. Where there is no overlap in ranges, a case of anticipation cannot be made.

Reference WO 2004/50045, determined to be an "X" reference cited in the international search report is not relied upon in a rejection since the publication date qualifies as a 102(a) and applicant's claim to provisional application 60/563,663 effectively overcomes this reference.

Reference JP-2000/313808, determined to be an "X" reference cited in the international search report is not relied upon in a rejection since the siloxane polyether structures taught therein do not anticipated those structures as claimed in the instant application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Feng et al. (US 2003/0040571).

It is the position of the Examiner that the claim preamble “a vesicle” composition recites a future intended use/function type limitation (i.e., a composition capable of forming vesicles). The courts have stated that if the body of a claim fully and intrinsically sets forth all of the limitations of the claimed invention, and the preamble merely states, for example, the purpose or intended use of the invention, rather than any distinct definition of any of the claimed invention’s limitations, then the preamble is not considered a limitation and is of no significance to claim construction. *Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 182 F.3d 1298, 1305, 51 USPQ2d 1161, 1165 (Fed. Cir. 1999). See also *Rowe v. Dror*, 112 F.3d 473, 478, 42 USPQ2d 1550, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“where a patentee defines a structurally complete invention in the claim body and uses the preamble only to state a purpose or intended use for the invention, the preamble is not a claim limitation”); *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d at 152, 88 USPQ2d at 480-81. See MPEP 2111.02 (II). In the instant case, to establish a case of anticipation, a prior art teaching disclosing the claim elements of instant claim 1 need only be *capable* of forming vesicles.

Claims 1-4: Feng et al. teaches an aqueous dispersion/microemulsion comprising a silicone polyether which satisfies the structural limitations of instant claims 1 and 2 (paragraphs 0010-0012). Feng et al. further teaches a process for preparing an aqueous dispersion/microemulsion comprising (I) combining a silicone polyether which satisfies the structural limitations of instant claim 1 (paragraphs 0010-0012), an optional water miscible solvent/co-surfactant such as a monohydroxy alcohol (paragraph 0013), and water followed by mixing the aqueous dispersion (paragraphs 0034-0037). Because Feng et al. teaches both the composition and process limitations of instant claim 3, it follows that the process taught by Feng et al. is capable of forming vesicles. The courts have stated that “Where the claimed and prior

art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established.” Further, if it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties (i.e., formation of vesicles) with only the claimed ingredients.

Claims 5-9: Feng et al. further teaches that the microemulsions can be used in various personal, household or healthcare compositions (paragraph 0044).

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Raleigh et al. (US Pat. 5,393,452).

Claims 1-4: Raleigh et al. teaches an aqueous composition comprising a silicone polyether which satisfies the structural limitations of instant claims 1 and 2 (10:55-11:2). Raleigh et al. further teaches a process for preparing an aqueous composition/dispersion comprising (I) combining a silicone polyether which satisfies the structural limitations of instant claim 1 (10:55-11:2), and water followed by mixing the aqueous dispersion (11:28-61). Because Raleigh et al. teaches both the composition and process limitations of instant claim 3, it follows that the process taught by Raleigh et al. is capable of forming vesicles. The courts have stated that “Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established.” Further, if it is the applicant's

position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties (i.e., formation of vesicles) with only the claimed ingredients.

Claims 5-9: Raleigh et al. further teaches that the microemulsions can be used in various personal, household or healthcare compositions (paragraph 0044).

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-9 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-5 and 9-10 of copending Application No. 10/592,399. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably

distinct from each other. The two differences between claims 1-3 of the instant application and claims 1 and 3-5 of copending application '399 is: (1) the value of x in the instant application can be from 251 to 1000 (instant claim 1) or 251-750 (instant claim 2) while in copending application '399, x can be from 1-1,000, and (2) the water miscible volatile solvent is an optional ingredient of the instant application but is a required ingredient in copending application 10/592,399. Instant claim 4 reads on claim 9 of the '399 copending application. Instant claims 5-9 read on claims 9 and 10 of the '399 copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### ***Relevant Art Cited***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon but is considered pertinent to applicants disclosure can be found on the attached PTO-892 form.

#### ***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Loewe whose telephone number is (571) 270-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 5:30 AM to 3:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. L./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1796  
11-Feb-08

/Randy Gulakowski/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796